

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



Reserve  
A56.7  
So3E

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
LIBRARY



Reserve  
BOOK NUMBER

913020

A56.7  
S03E

### 3<sup>0</sup> Estimating Field Soil Loss by the Factor System<sup>1/</sup>

The factor system for estimating soil loss combines in a rather simple equation the main elements that affect erosion. The approach is rational and not theoretical, as such an equation would be too complex for practical use even if it could be evaluated. The rational erosion equation is as follows:

$A = S L P C K$  in which

- A is average annual soil loss in tons per acre,
- S measures the effect of percent slope
- L measures the effect of slope length,
- P measures the effect of the supporting conservation practice,
- C is the soil loss measured for different rotations on plots under uniform soil, slope, and rainfall conditions,
- K is a soil factor enabling use of the data on soils other than that of the plot on which the values of C were secured.

The addition of a rainfall factor (R) to the equation would be required for application of the method over large areas. When the values of C are measured toward the center of a rainfall intensity area of limited variation, the inclusion of this factor is not required. This is the case for Missouri when data from the Missouri Soil Conservation Experiment Farm at McCredie are used.

SLOPE. The effect of percent slope on erosion with a loss of unity on the slope (3%) of the McCredie plots is shown in table 1.

Table 1.--Percent Slope Soil Loss Factors

<u>% Slope</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>% Slope</u>	<u>Factor</u>
1	.4	8	3.4
2	.7	9	3.9
3	1.0	10	4.5
4	1.4	11	5.1
5	1.8	12	5.7
6	2.3	15	7.7
7	2.8	20	11.5

<sup>1/</sup> Cooperative Research Unit, Soil Conservation Service, - Missouri  
 Agricultural Experiment Station, Agricultural Engineering Building,  
 Columbia, Missouri.

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

2. The second part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

3. The third part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

4. The fourth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

5. The fifth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

6. The sixth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

7. The seventh part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

8. The eighth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

9. The ninth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

10. The tenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

11. The eleventh part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

12. The twelfth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

13. The thirteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

14. The fourteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

15. The fifteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

16. The sixteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

17. The seventeenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

18. The eighteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

19. The nineteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

20. The twentieth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

21. The twenty-first part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

22. The twenty-second part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

23. The twenty-third part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

24. The twenty-fourth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

25. The twenty-fifth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

26. The twenty-sixth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

27. The twenty-seventh part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

28. The twenty-eighth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

29. The twenty-ninth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

30. The thirtieth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States.

The effect of slope length on erosion with a unity loss on the slope length (90 feet) of the McCredie plots is shown in table 2.

Table 2.--Slope Length Soil Loss Factors

<u>Length-Ft.</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Factor</u>
72.6	0.9	500	2.8
90	1.0	600	3.1
100	1.1	700	3.4
200	1.6	800	3.7
300	2.1	900	4.0
400	2.5	1000	4.2

Use of the slope length factors of table 2 will result in erroneous conclusions if the limits of application of the relationship are not considered in determining the slope length of a field. Soil loss increases with slope length only so long as the percent slope increases or remains constant. A decrease in percent slope generally results in deposition of soil a short distance beyond the point of decrease. The measured slope length for a field should be the shortest distance the runoff travels to reach this point.

CONTOURING. The relative reduction in soil loss by contouring varies with the steepness of slope. On the extremely flat slopes where the contour row grade approaches the land slope the reduction becomes small; also, as the land slope increases to the point that the capacity of the contour row to retain runoff disappears, the reduction in soil loss disappears. These factors are shown in table 3.

Table 3 --Practice Factors for Contouring

<u>% Slope</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>% Slope</u>	<u>P</u>
1	.74	8	.52
2	.60	9	.55
3	.54	10	.58
4	.52	11	.61
5	.50	12	.64
6	.50	15	.75
7	.51	20	.90

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a general discussion of the problem.

2. In the second part, we shall consider the case of a single particle.

3. The third part is devoted to the case of a system of particles.

4. In the fourth part, we shall consider the case of a continuous medium.

5. The fifth part is devoted to the case of a system of continuous media.

6. In the sixth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

7. The seventh part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

8. In the eighth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

9. The ninth part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

10. In the tenth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

11. The eleventh part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

12. In the twelfth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

13. The thirteenth part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

14. In the fourteenth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

15. The fifteenth part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

16. In the sixteenth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

17. The seventeenth part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

18. In the eighteenth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

19. The nineteenth part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

20. In the twentieth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

21. The twenty-first part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

22. In the twenty-second part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

23. The twenty-third part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

24. In the twenty-fourth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

25. The twenty-fifth part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

26. In the twenty-sixth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

27. The twenty-seventh part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

28. In the twenty-eighth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

29. The twenty-ninth part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

30. In the thirtieth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

31. The thirty-first part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

32. In the thirty-second part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

33. The thirty-third part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

34. In the thirty-fourth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

35. The thirty-fifth part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

36. In the thirty-sixth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

37. The thirty-seventh part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

38. In the thirty-eighth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

39. The thirty-ninth part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

40. In the fortieth part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

41. The forty-first part is devoted to the case of a system of particles and continuous media.

42. In the forty-second part, we shall consider the case of a system of particles and continuous media.



The problem of estimating soil loss with contouring may be simplified by combining the factors of table 1, 2 and 3 in a single table. This has been done in table 4.

Table 4.--Slope-Practice-Soil Loss Factors for Contouring

% Land Slope	Slope Length - Feet							
	90	200	300	400	500	600	800	1000
1	.3	.5	.6	.7	.8	.9	1.1	1.3
2	.4	.7	.9	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.6	1.8
3	.5	.9	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.7	2.0	
4	.7	1.2	1.5	1.8	2.0	2.3	2.7	
5	.9	1.4	1.9	2.3	2.5	2.8		
6	1.2	1.9	2.4	2.9	3.3	3.6		
7	1.4	2.3	3.0	3.6	4.0			
8	1.8	2.9	3.7	4.4	5.0			
9	2.2	3.5	4.5	5.4				
10	2.6	4.2	5.5	6.5				
11	3.1	5.0	6.5	7.7				
12	3.7	5.9	7.7					
15	5.8	9.3	12.1					
20	10.3	16.6	21.6					

Excess breaking over of contour rows occurs on the longer slopes. This is particularly serious with the more severe rain storms. Tentative slope length limitations for contouring are shown by the heavy line in table 4.

CROPPING. Soil losses under uniform slope, soil, and rainfall conditions vary over a wide range depending upon the cropping system. The crop sequence study at McCredie is one of the most intensive research projects on the subject in existence. The data from this project were used to prepare table 5. (following page)

1. The first part of the report is a general introduction to the subject of the study.

2. The second part of the report is a detailed description of the methods used in the study.

3. The third part of the report is a discussion of the results of the study.

4. The fourth part of the report is a conclusion and a list of references.

5. The fifth part of the report is a list of appendices.

6. The sixth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

7. The seventh part of the report is a list of footnotes.

8. The eighth part of the report is a list of references.

9. The ninth part of the report is a list of appendices.

10. The tenth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

11. The eleventh part of the report is a list of footnotes.

12. The twelfth part of the report is a list of references.

13. The thirteenth part of the report is a list of appendices.

14. The fourteenth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

15. The fifteenth part of the report is a list of footnotes.

16. The sixteenth part of the report is a list of references.

17. The seventeenth part of the report is a list of appendices.

18. The eighteenth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

19. The nineteenth part of the report is a list of footnotes.

20. The twentieth part of the report is a list of references.

21. The twenty-first part of the report is a list of appendices.

22. The twenty-second part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

23. The twenty-third part of the report is a list of footnotes.

24. The twenty-fourth part of the report is a list of references.

25. The twenty-fifth part of the report is a list of appendices.

26. The twenty-sixth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

27. The twenty-seventh part of the report is a list of footnotes.

28. The twenty-eighth part of the report is a list of references.

29. The twenty-ninth part of the report is a list of appendices.

30. The thirtieth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

31. The thirty-first part of the report is a list of footnotes.

32. The thirty-second part of the report is a list of references.

33. The thirty-third part of the report is a list of appendices.

34. The thirty-fourth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

35. The thirty-fifth part of the report is a list of footnotes.

36. The thirty-sixth part of the report is a list of references.

37. The thirty-seventh part of the report is a list of appendices.

38. The thirty-eighth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

39. The thirty-ninth part of the report is a list of footnotes.

40. The fortieth part of the report is a list of references.

41. The forty-first part of the report is a list of appendices.

42. The forty-second part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

43. The forty-third part of the report is a list of footnotes.

44. The forty-fourth part of the report is a list of references.

45. The forty-fifth part of the report is a list of appendices.

46. The forty-sixth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

47. The forty-seventh part of the report is a list of footnotes.

48. The forty-eighth part of the report is a list of references.

49. The forty-ninth part of the report is a list of appendices.

50. The fiftieth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

Table 5.--Average annual soil loss in tons per acre for different rotations, from plots on Putnam silt loam soil of 3% slope, 90 feet long, and farmed up and down slope.

Rotation	Residue returned	Soil loss tons/acre
Corn-oats (no treatment)	Corn stalks	8.6
Corn-oats & sweet clover	Corn stalks & sw cl <u>1/</u>	4.6
Corn-wheat & sweet clover	Sweet clover <u>1/</u>	4.4
Corn-corn-oats-wheat & sw cl	1st corn stalks & sw cl	5.7
Corn-wheat-sw cl & timothy	Stubble only	2.9
Corn-wheat-grass & leg mead 1 yr	Stubble only	1.9
Corn-wheat-grass & leg mead 2 yrs	Stubble only	1.6
Corn-corn-oats-grass & legume meadow 1 yr	Corn stalks <u>1/</u>	3.2
Corn-corn-oats-grass & legumes meadow 2 yrs	Corn stalks <u>1/</u>	2.7
Corn-soybeans (drill)-wheat & sw cl	Stalks, straw & sw cl <u>1/</u>	4.5
Corn-soybeans (row)-wheat & sw cl	Stalks, straw & sw cl <u>1/</u>	5.3
Corn-soybeans (drill)-wheat-grass legume meadow	Corn stalks <u>1/</u>	3.1
Corn-soybeans (row)-wheat-grass legume meadow	Corn stalks <u>1/</u>	3.8
Corn-soybeans (drill)-wheat & lespedeza-lespedeza	Stubble only	5.3
Soybeans (drill) & w bar (grazed)	Stubble only	4.5
Soybeans (drill)-w bar-grass leg mead	Stubble only	1.2
Soybeans (row)-wheat-grass leg mead	Straw <u>1/</u>	2.3
Oats (hay) & lesp (grazed)	Stubble only	3.0
Wheat & lesp (both grazed)	Stubble only	2.3
Oats & lesp (both for hay)	Stubble only	2.1
Wheat & lesp (grain & hay)	Stubble only	1.5
Wheat (grain)-grass leg mead 3 yrs (hay and pasture)	Stubble only <u>1/</u>	0.9
Timothy lesp (continuous) (grazed)	Stubble only	0.5

1/ Losses computed from crop sequence data.

AN EROSION ESTIMATE FOR THE CLAYPAN SOIL. Solution of the erosion equation by use of factors from tables 1, 2 and 5, with P and K both equal to 1, will give the expected loss for up-and-down-hill farming on claypan soils. With contour farming the expected loss would be the product of a slope-practice-soil loss factor from table 4 and the rotation loss from table 5.

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

LIMITING SOIL LOSSES. Perhaps no single question in the field of soil conservation is more difficult to answer than, "What is the allowable soil loss for a given soil?" Involved in the answer are the rate of weathering, size of particles and mineral content of the underlying material, climate, and a host of other variables. No single yardstick can be used in answering the question. But because organic matter reflects better than any other quality subject to measurement the effects of climate, mineral nutrient availability, and loss of the soil body from the surface, it has been used to throw some light on the problem.

There are some who think that erosion should be permitted to such an extent that mineral nutrients available in the subsoil would be incorporated in the plow layer at a rate commensurate with needs. In most, if not all, our soils in Missouri the underlying material simply is not that high in mineral nutrients. Even if it were, it is doubtful if the organic fraction could be maintained in face of such high losses at a level high enough to contribute its beneficial effects to structure and plant nutrition.

As a first approximation of allowable soil losses, subject to revision as more data become available, annual changes (%) in organic matter content have been plotted against soil loss (tons/acre). Data from the control plots at Bethany and Clarinda were used for Shelby and Marshall, respectively, and from the crop sequence plots at McCredie for Putnam. In each instance the change in organic matter content from the previous sampling was plotted against the soil loss during the same period on an annual basis. The line fitted to the points crosses the "no change" line between 3 and 4 tons per acre per annum for Marshall, 4 and 5 tons for Shelby, and 2 and 3 tons for Putnam. In other words, annual losses in excess of these amounts were accompanied by a decrease in fertility (organic matter) level. Fertility level was maintained or increased on plots having losses less than these amounts. As a basis for planning, it is suggested that a loss of 4 tons per acre per year be used for Marshall and Shelby and 3 tons for Putnam.

Data are not available for other soils of the state, but considering the soil characteristics, it seems safe to suggest the 4 ton figure for all except the claypan, Osark, and border Ozark soils. For these latter areas, the value of 3 tons would be preferred.

THE SOIL FACTOR IN THE EROSION EQUATION. Physical limitations prohibit comprehensive investigations on all soils of the state. Yet it is well known that under comparable conditions of slope, cropping, etc., all Missouri soils would not erode at the same rate. Some efforts have been made to place a value on the effect of soil characteristics, but up to the present, these are only estimates serving until more exact information is available.





Using the slope relationships already discussed and keeping the cropping system comparable, values relative to Putnam have been computed for Shelby, Marshall, and Fayette. These data were collected at Bethany, Clarinda, Iowa, and LaCrosse, Wisconsin. In the case of Fayette, an adjustment was made to correct for a rainfall difference. The results of these computations were:

<u>Soil</u>	<u>Relative Soil Loss</u>
Shelby	1.3
Marshall	1.2
Fayette	1.2
Putnam	1.0

From a theoretical point of view these values seem logical if one considers the structure and permeability together. Putnam has the poorest structure of any. It is easily dispersed, and particles on the surface arrange themselves in a shingle effect. Such an arrangement on the surface sheds water without the movement of excessive soil. Shelby, Marshall, and Fayette, on the other hand, with more stable aggregates that remain independent, are more easily transported once the rate of rainfall exceeds permeability. Shelby, with its tighter subsoil, should logically be more erosive than Marshall on this basis under conditions of equal rainfall intensity.

Observations in the field, principally by Krusekopf, would indicate the Ozark soils are less erosive than the Putnam. Here again poor structure permits a sealing on the surface. Streams in the Ozark region always react more quickly to rain than those in North Missouri despite the high percentage of trees, adding credence to this reasoning. Krusekopf would place the Western Ozark Border soils in the same category as the Ozark proper, but would class the Eastern Ozark Border with the Marshall and River Hills region.

Sufficient data are not available to place a value on each soil of the state, but there is some basis for suggesting the values listed in Table 6 by soil areas. (See Mo. Agr. Exp. Sta. Cir. 304, August 1945).

Table 6.--Soil Factors in Missouri

<u>Soil Area</u>	<u>Factor</u>
Shelby and associated glacial soils	1.3
River Hills, Marshall and associated loess soils, and Eastern Ozark Border	1.2
Claypans (NE and SW level prairies)	1.0
Ozarks and western Ozark border	.8





TERRACING. Estimating soil loss with terracing follows a somewhat different pattern than with contouring as the length of slope is limited by the spacing recommendations. Slope factors for terracing are shown in Table 7.

Table 7.. -- (P) Slope-Soil Loss Factors for Terracing

<u>% Slope</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>% Slope</u>	<u>Factor</u>
1	.4	8	2.4
2	.6	9	2.8
3	.8	10	3.3
4	1.0	11	3.8
5	1.3	12	4.5
6	1.6	15	6.6
7	2.0	20	10.0

The soil movement to the terrace channel is the product of a factor from table 7 and the rotation loss from table 5. Experiments have shown that the loss from the terrace channel in runoff will be about 10% of this product. On the flatter slopes the actual deposition in the channel is generally of little consequence, even though it is 90% of the total soil movement. The channel deposition will reach a significant amount on the steeper slopes unless low soil loss rotations are used. The use of the more intensive rotations can be extended to steeper slopes by periodic moving of the deposition soil back up the slope. This can be readily accomplished by turning all furrow slices up slope whenever the cropping plan calls for plowing. A two-way or hillside plow will be required in place of the conventional plow.

Selection of a rotation to limit channel deposition to a practical amount can be easily done by use of table 8. If the plot soil loss for a selected rotation from table 5 does not exceed the tabulated value for the land slope of the field and the method of plowing shown in table 8, the channel deposition will not be excessive. For other soils than the Putnam, the plot rotation soil loss of table 5 must be multiplied by the appropriate soil factor from table 6 before checking with the tabulated values in table 8.



Table 8.--Allowable Plot Soil Losses for Different Methods of Plowing Terraced Land

Land Slope	Allowable plot rotation soil loss				
	Conventional contour plowing or discing	Up-hill plowing once in indicated number of years			
		1	2	3	4
1	14.0	39.6	26.8	22.6	20.5
2	9.2	30.6	20.0	16.3	14.6
3	6.8	25.1	16.0	13.0	11.4
4	5.3	21.2	13.3	10.6	9.4
5	4.2	17.4	10.8	8.6	7.5
6	3.3	14.6	9.0	7.1	6.1
7	2.8	12.8	7.8	6.1	5.3
8	2.3	10.9	6.6	5.1	4.4
9	1.9	9.5	5.8	4.5	3.9
10	1.7	8.4	5.1	3.9	3.3
11	1.4	7.5	4.5	3.4	2.9
12	1.2	6.5	3.9	3.0	2.5
15	.8	4.5	2.7	2.1	1.8
20	.5	3.0	1.8	1.4	1.2





